

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, and 19-23 are in this application with claims 4, 20, and 22 having been amended.

In the office action claims 4 and 22 and claims 18 and 20 are objected to as being substantial duplicates. By these amendments it is submitted that the bases for duplication have been removed and that as amended neither claims 4 and 22 or claims 18 and 20 are substantial duplicates. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claim 20 for certain informalities, it is submitted that these informalities have been addressed by these amendments to claims 20. The alleged changes to claim 20 in the Amendment submitted November 25, 2005, were inadvertent, the original language of claim 20 was not intended to be changed by that Amendment. Claim 20 is amended herein to place it in conformity with the claim as originally submitted with this application.

The Examiner rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is submitted that the Examiner's grounds for rejecting claims 21 under § 112 have been addressed by the instant amendments. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-4, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 101,393 ("the '393 patent"). Claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-12, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '393 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,559 ("the '559 patent"). Finally, claims 6-7, 9, 12-13, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '393 patent in view of U.S. Application Publication No. US 2003/0012348. For at least the reasons stated below, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the office action at paragraph 10, the examiner equates the signal processing means of claim 1 to one or all of SMS-IWMSC 30, Service Centre 35 and/or SMS-GATEWAY MSC 40 of the '393 patent. Claim 1 requires that the signal processing means intercepts a routing query directed to the HLR, responds to the routing query on behalf of the HLR and provides a modified address. With regard to SMS-IWMSC 30, as described in the '393 patent this element serves to transmit the SMS message to the Service Centre 35. As described in the '393 patent, no routing query signal has been issued thus there can be no interception thereof at that stage. The Service Centre 35 serves to buffer the short message and then transmit the message to SMS-GMSC 40. Similarly, as no routing query signal has been issued interception of such a signal is not yet possible.

According to the '393 patent the SMS-GMSC 40 then interrogates the HLR 26 to ascertain the destination MSC 14 (for those messages sent by a sender on the accept list of the HLR 26). As stated at column 4, lines 22-27 of the '393 patent the SMS-GMSC 40 THEN issues a Send Routing Information request, ie a routing query. Accordingly the as taught by the '393 patent, the SMS-GMSC 40 does not equate to the signal processing means of claim 1 since in the '393 patent the SMS-GMSC 40 issues the routing query and does not intercept the query. Importantly the according to the '393 patent, the routing signal is sent directly to the HLR in the conventional manner, thus there is no interception of the routing query. Accordingly, the '393 patent does not teach the signal processing means recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the '393 patent and is allowable. For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is submitted that independent claims 17 and 21 also patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the '393 patent and are also allowable.

It is further submitted that the shortcomings of the '393 patent are not addressed by either the '559 patent or the '348 application. Accordingly, claims 2, 4-16, and 19, 20, and 22-23 which depend from an allowable base claim are allowable therewith.

**CONCLUSION**

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
Ronald R. Santucci  
Reg. No. 28,988  
(212) 588-0800